

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

JOSHUA R. MARSHALL,

Defendant and Appellant.

B250152

(Los Angeles County  
Super. Ct. No. MA059552)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior court of Los Angeles County.  
Christopher G. Estes, Judge. Affirmed.

Joshua R. Marshall, in pro. per.; and Maureen L. Fox, under appointment by the  
Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

---

In August 2010, Joshua Marshall pleaded no contest to two counts of first degree burglary in exchange for dismissal of five other burglary and theft-related counts, imposition of an eight year prison term, and suspension of that term in favor of three years formal probation. In April 2013, Marshall was charged with four counts of burglary and theft-related crimes in Antelope Valley, California. In May 2013, Marshall was charged in the instant case with one count of residential (first degree) burglary and one count of commercial (second degree) burglary. He pleaded no contest to count 1.

The trial court found the plea was factually supported and knowing, intelligent and voluntary. Consistent with a plea agreement, the court dismissed prosecution and probation revocation proceedings stemming from the April 2013 charges, sentenced Marshall to 17 years in prison, and ordered him to pay restitution fines and assessments and provide biological samples. The court recommended, at Marshall's request, that the Department of Corrections evaluate him for possible placement in a fire camp.

Defendant timely appealed after obtaining a certificate of probable cause. We appointed counsel to represent him on appeal, and after examination of the record, appointed counsel filed an opening brief raising no issues and asking this court to independently review the record. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441-442.) On December 12, 2013, we sent letters to defendant and appointed counsel, directing counsel to immediately forward the appellate record to defendant and advising defendant that within 30 days he could personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider.

Defendant responded with a one-page letter in which he denied having entered the victim's residence but raised no other substantive issues. Defendant requested that we review the record on his behalf.

We have examined the entire record and found no arguable issue of any sort. We are therefore satisfied that defendant's appointed counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109-110; *People v. Wende*, *supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

**DISPOSITION**

The judgment is affirmed.  
NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

CHANEY, J.

We concur:

ROTHSCHILD, Acting P. J.

MILLER, J.<sup>\*</sup>

---

<sup>\*</sup> Judge of the Los Angeles Superior Court, assigned by the Chief Justice pursuant to article VI, section 6 of the California Constitution.